Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad, in DA No. 24/86 on the 5th September, 1990;

(b) if so, what steps Government have taken to implement the Tribunal's verdict;

(c) if not, the reasons therefor; and

(d) whether it is a fact that Rail way Administration have decided not to appeal against the Tribunal's awards?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c)The Government are proposing to file Special Leave Petitions in the Supreme Court against the Tribunal's verdict on certain points where authoritative opinion of the Supreme Court is required. In view of this, the Tribunal's verdict has not been implemented.

(d) No, Sir. The Railway Administrations do file appeals where they consider that important questions of law/matters of public interest are involved.

Development of tourism in Assam

1016. SHRI BHADRESWAR BURAGOHAIN: Will the Minister of TOURISM be pleased t_0 state;

(a) what are the proposals under Government's consideration in regard to develop tourism in Assam;

(b) whether Government have cleared some of the proposals; and

(c) what are the names of the projects cleared by Government and the projects which are yet to be given clearance by Government?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN -•THE MINISTRY OF TOURISM (SMT. USHA SINGH): (a) In consultation with the Government of Assam, the following schemes have been prioritised for Assam: —

, (1) Tourist Complex at Kazi-ranga.

(2) Wayside facilities at Jakhal-banda.

(3) Yatri Niwas at Guwahati.

(4) Trekking equipment for Bra-ulch Hills.

(b) and (c) Sanction has been issued for an amount of Rs. 14. 81 lakhs for a Tourist Complex at Kazi-ranga National Park. However other projects with detailed estimates are awaited from the State Government.

Examination for Non-Technical Categories conducted by Railway Recruitment Board, Madras

1017. SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Will . the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Railway Recruitment Board, Madras held a written examination for nontechnical popular categories on 15th November, 1987;

(b) whether the results of the said examination were withheld; if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) where a second examination was conducted by RRB, Madras on 7th May, 1989;

(d) whether the Madras High Court gave interim injunction restraining for holding of the second examination by the RRB, Madras;

(e) whether the High Court made the absolute interim injunction granted by them against holding the second examination;

(f) if so, whether the RRB, Madras has failed to follow up their challenge against High Court's jurisdiction in the matter;

(g) whether it is a fact that the matter is not 'subjudice' as made out by the RRB, Madras; and

(h) if so, the details thereof and whether the Railway Board would issue orders for declaring the results of examination held on 15th November, 1987?